DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 697 FL 025 501

AUTHOR Morino, Hiroaki
TITLE Writing and Reading: Exploiting Their Similarities in Teaching. Suggestions for High School English Teachers in Japan.
PUB DATE 1998-03-00
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom - Teacher (052)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; Cognitive Processes; Comparative Analysis; Educational Needs; Educational Strategies; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; High Schools; *Language Processing; Language Teachers; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Processes; Second Language Instruction; Teacher Education; *Writing Instruction; *Writing Processes
IDENTIFIERS *Japan

ABSTRACT

Two key parallels exist between reading and writing, each with profound implications for the teaching of these skills, and which can be adapted for the situation in Japanese high schools, where reading and writing classes are separate. First, on a theoretical level, writing and reading are cognitively similar in that they are both active and recursive processes, a parallel that implies that they are learned and can be taught in similar ways. Second, on a more practical level, they are processes that depend on and reinforce one another in ordinary use. Based on these parallels, two sets of specific suggestions are presented for Japanese teachers of English, one for writing teachers and one for reading teachers, with sample teaching exercises. Three reading passages are appended. Contains 22 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 423 697

Writing and Reading: Exploiting Their Similarities in Teaching

Suggestions for High School English Teachers in Japan

Hiroaki Morino
Shimizu Higashi Senior High School
Shizuoka Prefecture
March, 1998

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hiroaki Morino

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL025501

Writing and Reading:
Exploiting Their Similarities in Teaching

Contents

Introduction 1

Ⅰ. The present situation of English teaching in Japanese high schools 2

A. General overview 2

B. The teaching of writing and reading in English classes 2

C. Inadequate methodology training of English teachers 4

Ⅱ. Parallels between writing and reading and implications for teaching English 5

A. Cognitive similarities of writing and reading and implications for teaching 5

1. Cognitive similarities of writing and reading 5

2. General implications of these cognitive similarities: Teaching writing and reading as active and recursive 9

B. Close relationship in practice between writing and reading and implications for teaching 10

1. Close practical linkages 10

2. General implications of the practical linkages: Integrating writing and reading in teaching 12

Ⅲ. Suggestions for Japanese high school teachers of English 16

A. Practical suggestions for the writing teacher: teaching writing as an active constructive recursive process, closely linked to reading 16

B. Practical suggestions for the reading teacher: teaching reading as an active constructive recursive process, closely linked to writing 20

Conclusion 26

Appendix 1 Reading 1: Japanese and American Baths 27

Appendix 2 Reading 2: Louis Armstrong's Life 29

Appendix 3 Reading 3: Louis Armstrong As a Child in the Waifs' Home 32

Bibliography 34

Writing and Reading: Exploiting Their Similarities in Teaching

Introduction

When proficient writers write a text, they think of the readers of the text. They try to state as explicitly as possible what they really want to say so that the readers can understand it easily. Conversely, when proficient readers read a text, they think of the writer of the text. They try to reconstruct what the writer really wanted to say. That is, people cannot write without thinking of the reader, and people cannot read without thinking of the writer. It is evident that writing and reading have a close relationship.

However, the present situation of teaching English writing and reading in Japanese high schools fails to reflect any link between writing and reading. First, the writing class and the reading class are separate courses, taught by different teachers. Second, in both the writing and the reading classes, translation is still emphasized, and teachers spend a great amount of time teaching how to translate well, so that Japanese is being used to accomplish both writing in English and reading in English. Writing in English is not used to help accomplish reading in English, or vice versa. The close relationship between writing in English and reading in English is not exploited in either course.

We Japanese teachers of English need to stop to think whether translation is necessary in teaching English. At the same time, we need to think about what writing is and what reading is. Moreover, if there is close relationship between writing and reading, we need to exploit it positively in both the writing class and the reading class.

This paper examines these issues. It will be seen that two key parallels exist between writing and reading, each with profound implications for teachers of writing and reading, implications which can be specifically adapted for the situation in Japan where the writing and the reading classes are separate. First, on a theoretical level, writing and reading are cognitively similar in both being active and recursive processes, a parallel that implies that they are learned, and can be taught, in similar ways. Second, on a more practical level, writing and reading are processes that depend on and reinforce one another in ordinary use, a parallel that implies that one can be exploited in teaching to reinforce the teaching/learning of the other. Finally, based on these two broad parallels and their general pedagogical implications, two sets of specific suggestions for Japanese teachers of English are presented, one set for the writing teacher and another set for the reading teacher, including sample teaching exercises.

Ⅰ. The present situation of English teaching in Japanese high schools

A. General overview

Generally speaking, the teaching of English in Japanese high schools is shaped, even distorted, by the university entrance examinations. The questions on these examinations measure grammatical knowledge, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. The focus is primarily on accuracy, without attention to fluency. As for writing, it is tested on almost all university entrance examinations. However, it is not writing in a true sense, but rather, simply translation of Japanese into English. As for reading, most of the reading comprehension questions include translation of English into Japanese. These kinds of questions measure not so much English proficiency as Japanese proficiency. Furthermore, speaking is not tested at all, and listening comprehension is nearly neglected. That is, the listening comprehension test is assigned only to those test-takers who want to major in foreign language or foreign literature.

Because it is quite difficult to enter good universities, many teachers of English in Japanese high schools teach English so that their students can pass the university entrance examinations. That is, they focus on grammar, vocabulary, reading, and translation in their teaching. They value accuracy rather than fluency. Thus, English teaching in high school is distorted in that few teachers teach English as a means of communication.

B. The teaching of writing and reading in English classes

The teaching of writing in the English classes of Japanese high schools is strongly influenced by the university entrance exams. Roughly speaking, "writing" in Japanese high schools means translation of Japanese into English, just as "writing" is tested on the university entrance examinations by translation of Japanese into English. "Writing in English" almost always means working *from* Japanese, never *in* English alone. Moreover, the "content" is typically provided by the Japanese original, so that students seldom have a choice of what they write. In addition, all the writing is sentence level. Students seldom write paragraphs and they never write essays. In short, writing in English in the Japanese high schools is typically prescribed and constrained, with an emphasis on translation from Japanese.

The situation is similar for the teaching of reading. It is typically done to address the demands of entrance exams. Most teachers still teach reading with the *yakudoku* method. The *yakudoku* method is often called a "grammar translation" method, but, in actuality, unlike most grammar translation methods, involves little focus on the grammar of the English text.

Yakudoku is "a three-stage operation, involving first a word-by-word translation [or gloss] of the target sentence, then a reordering of the words thus derived [into Japanese order], and finally a recoding into Japanese syntax. ... It focuses more on understanding the valued contents of the translated text than on mastering the codes of the language itself" (Law, 1995, p.215). Law (1995) clearly reveals the drawbacks of *yakudoku*:

> At the end of the translation class, students are left with a text in their native language to contemplate and review. Preparation for the translation exams will often come down to memorization of this recorded version; the original alien code will have been largely displaced from view; the effective educational content may be largely limited to training in the student's native language. (p.216)

This "translation" or *yakudoku* method directly addresses the university entrance exam's reading comprehension questions, which include translation of English into Japanese.

However, recently, longer passages have begun to be used as reading comprehension texts in university entrance examinations. As a result, some teachers of English have begun to pay attention to rapid reading. [Probably it would be more accurate to call it, not rapid reading, but faster reading!] Anyway, Japanese teachers of English now feel a need to teach students how to read longer texts in a limited time. Some teachers have begun to teach reading strategies, such as skimming and scanning. Some of them have begun to teach how English texts are organized. Text organization in English is different from that in Japanese, so it is very useful for the students to know English text organization in order to read faster. These principles are all very noticeable changes in reading instruction, but the number of the teachers who teach these is still limited.

Finally, because of the way writing and reading are each taught in response to the question types on the university entrance exams, there is no integration of writing and reading in the teaching of English in the Japanese high schools. As stated above, writing in Japanese high school is actually translation of Japanese into English, so the students seldom have chance to use writing linked to reading. Thus, for example, they typically don't write down their responses after reading, they don't take notes in English while they are reading, and they don't write down questions or ideas on a topic before reading about that topic. Moreover, because students generally aren't asked to think individually but simply to translate the same sentences, students generally never read what other students write. In short, in the present situation, there is no integration of writing and reading in Japanese high school.

C. Inadequate methodology training of English teachers

The problems with English language instruction deriving from the demands of the university entrance exams are perpetuated due to serious inadequacies in the training that teachers receive in language teaching methodology. In truth, in order to become teachers of English in high school in Japan, no knowledge of how to teach English is necessary. Teachers-to-be receive little training in how to teach English while they are at the university. Specifically, many Japanese high school teachers of English have not had even one course in the methodology of English teaching. Moreover, teacher certification tests for teachers of English do not test knowledge of how to teach English. As a result, most teachers have very little knowledge about methodology, so that it is simply impossible for them to improve the way that English is taught. They have no choice. They cannot help teaching English the same way they were taught. This situation is a serious problem that makes improvement of the English teaching in Japanese high schools very difficult to achieve. Improvement in Japanese English language teaching will come if teacher candidates begin to learn new methodologies of English teaching while in the university. If they were to receive such training in new teaching methodologies, as new candidates became teachers of English every year, there could at least be some arguments about methodology among the staff in each high school.

The Ministry of Education has recognized that there are shortcomings in English language teaching in Japan, and has made a concerted effort to improve English language instruction. Several years ago, it instituted the policy that English should be taught as a means of communication, and it began to encourage teachers of English to teach English in a communicative way. Moreover, it instituted some teacher training programs for in-service teachers. Nevertheless, progress has been slow. Even today few teachers know how to teach English in a communicative way. Some of them are trying to change their way of teaching through trial and error, but many others are still teaching English in a traditional way. Teachers need all the information they can get about methodologies for teaching English as a means of communication. This paper represents one small source of such information about important methodological principles for in-service teachers of writing and of reading.

Ⅱ. Parallels between writing and reading and implications for teaching English

In this chapter, I would like to focus on the parallels that exist between writing and reading. The chapter will be divided into two main parts: The first part is more theoretical in focus, examining cognitive similarities of writing and reading. The second part is more practical in focus, pointing out the close relation or inter-linkages between writing and reading in actual use. In each case, I will first highlight the parallel between writing and reading, and then consider its general implications for teaching English.

A. Cognitive similarities of writing and reading and implications for teaching

1. Cognitive similarities of writing and reading

There are two key cognitive similarities of writing and reading that can be identified in the considerable study that has been done on them: (a) they are both *active* processes and (b) they are both *recursive* processes.

a. Writing and reading as *active* processes

Writing and reading as active processes both include at least three parameters: (i) active construction of meaning, (ii) interactiveness, and (iii) activation of schemata.

Active construction of meaning in both writing and reading

Both writing and reading are processes which involve *active construction* of meaning. In the traditional view, writing was thought to be a process of organizing ideas, excluding the process of formulating ideas. Thus, the writers were assumed "to formulate their ideas beforehand, to elaborate upon them by using some prescribed rhetorical framework and [thus] to produce written products" (Zamel, 1982, p.197). However, recent researchers have a quite different notion of writing. They view writing as "the process of exploring one's thoughts and learning from the act of writing itself what these thoughts are" (ibid.). They argue that, in the process of writing, people do not have their ideas beforehand; on the contrary they construct their meaning through writing itself. In other words, people write what they think they have in mind on the paper, read their own sentence to see what it expresses, and finally decide if it is what they really wanted to say. They *don't really know* what they mean until they write it. Writing it down helps "construct" the meaning itself. The notion that writing is a process of active construction of meaning seems to be very persuasive.

Less obvious perhaps is the fact that reading, too, can be thought to be a process of active construction of meaning. The traditional view was that reading was more "passive" than writing, that the meaning "existed" in the text and merely had to be uncovered by the reader. Today, many researchers explicitly reject the traditional notion that reading is a process of decoding what the writer expressed in the text and extracting meaning from the text. For example, Shanahan (1984) explains that "reading is no longer described as a passive activity in which subjects, essentially with accuracy, decode and record traces of external reality (i.e. text) in memory" (p.466). Rather, he continues, "readers construct or create meanings through a variety of active processes" (p.466). That is, meaning is not in a text but in the reader. Carrell and Eisterhold (1983) support this notion. They state that "the basic point is that much of the meaning understood from a text is really not actually in the text, per se, but in the reader, in the background or schematic knowledge of the reader" (p.559). In short, as Shih (1992) states, "Skilled readers comprehend text by actively constructing meaning, integrating information from the text with relevant information from their background knowledge"(p.291).

Thus, both writing and reading are processes which involve active construction of meaning.

Interactiveness of both writing and reading

In addition to involving construction of meaning, both writing and reading are active processes in a second sense as well: both are *interactive* processes between the text and the reader/writer.

In writing, there is an interaction between the text and the writer. That is, writers always wonder if what they have just written is what they really want to say. They read what they have just written, think about it to decide if the text and their meaning coincide. They use the text to examine their thoughts and use their thoughts to examine the text. In other words, writing involves an interaction between their own texts and their own knowledge. Eisterhold (1990), citing Shanklin (1982), states that "writing, like reading, is an interactive and dynamic" process (p.90).

Likewise, in reading readers read a text and interpret the meaning based on their background knowledge. Meaning is not in the text from the beginning, but is constructed through *interactive negotiation* between the text and the readers. Carrell and Eisterhold (1983) explain that "reading comprehension is an interactive process between the text and the reader's prior background knowledge. Reading comprehension involves one's knowledge of the world, which may be culturally based and culturally biased" (p.553). Barnett (1989) also

claims that "according to advocates of this theory, reading is an interactive process in which the author's perspective, points of view, allusions, or arguments are interpreted through the reader's experiences, perspective, cultural orientation, and biases" (p.42).

Thus, in both writing and reading, there is an interaction between a text and the reader/writer. The only difference is who wrote the text. In writing, writers read and react to what they themselves wrote, whereas in reading, readers read and react to what another person wrote.

Activation of schemata in both writing and reading

The third cognitive similarity between writing and reading as active processes is that both require an *activation of schemata* to proceed. "Schemata" in this sense refers to "previously acquired knowledge structures" (Carrell and Eisterhold, 1983, p.556), or, roughly, the background knowledge of the writer or reader. Both writing and reading involve activation of schemata.

In writing, schemata activation is extremely important. One of the hardest parts of writing is to get and form ideas. Zamel (1982) states that "an important dimension of the writing process involves the period before the actual writing begins, that is, how writers get and form ideas before putting pen to paper" (p.199). We all know that many people have trouble getting started writing even if they are given plenty of time because they cannot seem to find what they should write. It may take a lot of time and effort to get these ideas flowing. This is because writers need to activate their background knowledge for application in the writing task at hand. This process of "pulling out" what they know (but don't necessarily know that they know) is what is meant by "activation of schemata". Proficient writers typically use a variety of techniques to pull out ideas. For example, they may discuss a given topic with other people or read several relevant books. Eventually they are able to get at what they know and apply it in writing. In short, "activation of schemata" is essential for writing.

In a parallel way, in reading, according to Carrell and Eisterhold (1983), "the appropriate schemata (1) must exist and (2) must be activated during text processing" (p.560), if the reader is to "understand" a text he/she is reading. They explain that "new information, new concepts, new ideas [in the reading text] can have meaning only when they can be related to something the individual already knows" (p.553), i.e. to his/her "schemata". Barnett (1989) explains that schemata "constitute the framework into which the reader must fit what she or he understands from the text. If new textual information does not make sense in terms of a reader's schemata, the material is comprehended in a different way, or ignored, or the

schemata are revised to match the new facts"(p.42). Carrell and Eisterhold (1983) explain that one of the reasons why readers sometimes fail to activate an appropriate schema is that they simply do not have a particular schema the author expects them to have. Moreover, even if readers have background knowledge about the subject, actual "activation" of it must occur for comprehension to occur. For example, some knowledge may not come readily to mind. Other knowledge may take a great deal of time to come to mind. No matter how much knowledge readers have, it cannot be used in interpreting the text if they do not refer to it, if they do not apply it to the text. In short, an activated appropriate schema is the key to appropriate interpretation of the text.

b. *Recursiveness* of both writing and reading

Along with their cognitive similarity in being *active* processes in these various ways, a second key cognitive similarity between writing and reading is that both are *recursive* processes.

It is easy to see that writing is a recursive process, because when we write, we take it for granted that we have to revise our writing again and again. Reid (1993) states that "for many writers, the process of putting words on paper is 'two steps forward, one step back,' a process of ebb and flow as they write" (p.8). Zamel (1982) comments that "writers go back in order to move forward" (p.197). Both statements clearly reflect the fact that writing is a recursive process.

Less obvious, perhaps, is the fact that reading is recursive as well. Reading's recursiveness is pointed out by Zamel (1992). She suggests that one way that we can come to comprehend that reading is recursive is to look at what we do when we write down our responses to something we have read.

> Writing [about something we have read] invites us to entertain our initial responses, to offer tentative reactions, but then allows us to go back into the text [that we previously read], and to revise these original readings. Thus, it [=writing down our responses] helps us to understand that *reading changes as we bring new responses to it, that reading is open to revision, that reading is work in progress*. (p.472) [Italics mine].

She points out another reality that highlights the recursiveness of reading: By looking at the variety of text interpretations that other people may give for a single text, we become "aware of the existence and legitimacy of multiple interpretations" and we then "have yet new frameworks with which *to go back and read the text*" again (p.473. Italics mine). In other

words, our interpretation is likely to change as we get new frameworks, which means that reading is a recursive process.

That is, in addition to being active processes, writing and reading are cognitively similar in that they are both also recursive processes.

2. General implications of these cognitive similarities: Teaching writing and reading as active and recursive

As described the section above, writing and reading have marked cognitive similarities. Teachers in both the reading classroom and the writing classroom can benefit from recognizing that writing and reading entail almost the same processes. That is, with this recognition, teachers can help the students approach either process---whether writing or reading---as a process of active recursive construction of meaning through interaction between texts and writer's/reader's schemata. Four general implications for teaching both writing and reading emerge from the cognitive similarities of writing and reading.

Ideas in writing and text interpretation in reading are constructed by interaction between texts and writers'/readers' schemata. Both depend on the writers'/readers' schemata. The implication is that the teacher needs to get the student to see that if he knows nothing about the topic, he can neither write about it nor comprehend a reading about it! Students need to understand that both writing and reading depend on background knowledge!

A second implication is that teachers need to provide a rich variety of means to facilitate the activation of schemata. Writers and readers can activate their schemata in two ways. One is on their own, and the other is with other people's help. The teacher can encourage this process through a variety of techniques. Students can activate their schemata on their own by individually doing pre-writing/pre-reading activities (e.g. webbing, mapping, and brainstorming) normally assigned or suggested by the teacher. In addition, in writing, the teacher can help students activate appropriate schemata or expand their schemata through having them read other students' writing, and having them get other students' comments about their own writing. In reading, the teacher can help the students access their schemata also through having them write their feelings about or responses to texts while reading. On the other hand, the teacher can also help the students activate their schemata with the help of other students. In this case, their schemata can be activated by doing pre-reading/pre-writing activities provided by the teacher together with some other students or in the whole class. Furthermore, in reading, students' schemata can be activated also through reading other students' feelings about or responses to texts and getting other students' comments about the feelings and responses. In both writing and reading, if students exchange their writing with

each other, they can give a part of their schemata to other students, and at the same time, they can get a part of the schemata of other students. Such collaborative activities can be very helpful to the students in that they can realize that there can be various writer responses when people are given the same topic and that there can be various interpretations when people read the same texts .

The third implication of the cognitive similarity of writing and reading in being active and recursive is that the teacher should have the students go back to writing/reading again and again. From this "re-visiting" of the task, students will come to understand that their later writing/interpretation may be different from their initial writing/interpretation. Students can understand that both writing and reading are influenced by changes in their schemata and that they are recursive processes.

A final implication for the teaching of both writing and reading is that after students finish writing about a particular topic, or after they finish reading a text about a particular topic, teachers can have them read another relevant text having the same topic, or have them do another writing by giving them a related topic. The significant advantage is that "schemata are repeatedly accessed and further expanded and refined, resulting in increased comprehension" (Carrell and Eisterhold, 1983, p.567) because "new concepts and vocabulary are recycled and reinforced" (Shih, 1992, p.295). By giving a related assignment as a second round, teachers can give the students a chance to *use* the new information acquired through the previous writing/reading. This kind of assignment from the teacher can make the students feel that writing/reading is becoming easier for them. Students will surely understand that both writing and reading are greatly influenced by what they learned by doing them before---their schemata.

B. Close relationship in practice between writing and reading and implications for teaching

Besides the cognitive similarities between writing and reading in a theoretical sense, there are close inter-linkages or relationships between writing and reading in a practical sense.

1. Close practical linkages

There is a close practical relationship between writing and reading in two respects. One is that writing and reading provide information sources to each other. The other is that, because writing and reading stand in a complementary relationship with each other, doing one tends to reinforce and improve the other.

First, writing and reading each create information sources for the other. Writing a text creates an information source for the writer that he can then use in reading; reading a text creates an information source for the reader that he can then use in writing. That is, when we write, we can use some information we learned earlier through reading, and when we read, we can use some information we learned previously through writing.

It is easy to see that in **writing**, reading often provides us with information we can use. We all "borrow" ideas from pieces that we have read for use in our writing. Besides taking ideas, we often "steal" specific aspects of text and language from what we have read (e.g. text organization, and word selection). Reid (1993) claims that readers "accumulate schema---often unconsciously---about the formats of English writing and the expectations of the U.S. academic audience" (p.65) from their reading. This supports the idea that reading gives us information which can be used when we write. The converse is also true. That is, in **reading**, writing often provides us with information we can use. For example, sentence, paragraph, and discourse structures learned from writing may be utilized when we read.

The other practical relationship between writing and reading is that doing one tends to reinforce doing the other. That is, writing and reading stand in a complementary, bi-directional relationship to one another: reading reinforces and improves writing; writing reinforces and improves reading. Each stimulates and improves the other.

There are two ways in which reading can reinforce **writing**: (1) reading one's own texts reinforces one's writing; (2) reading other people's texts reinforces one's writing. When writers write, they of course read their own texts. By doing so, writers can see if their intention and expression are the same. If they are the same, writers can go ahead. If they are not the same, writers will want to revise. In any case, reading reinforces writing. Moreover, reading others' writing can clearly reinforce one's own writing. Writers do not always have enough knowledge about a given topic. They often have to get ideas or information from other people. Before or while writing, they try to get information, often through reading: reading several relevant books, reading information from the Internet, reading some other people's notebooks, etc. Collecting information through reading stimulates writers, generates ideas, and leads them to write. In this sense, reading reinforces and improves writing.

The converse also is true: writing reinforces and improves **reading**. A persuasive explanation supporting the idea that writing reinforces reading can be found in Zamel (1992). She describes the positive effects of writing about a text that has been previously read.

> Because the process of writing shares much in common with the process of learning, [writing about a text that has been read] gives rise to the generation and reconceptualization of ideas that may not have been possible otherwise. The heuristic nature of writing allows one to discover and consider one's stance, one's interpretation, one's immediate reactions to a text. Moreover, it makes these responses to a text overt, concrete, and tangible. Making [readers] conscious [through writing about texts] of their own reactions to texts gives these readers the sense that experienced readers have when they read. (p.470)

When readers try to discover their stances, interpretation, and reactions, in order to write them down, they are normally forced to go back to the text and read it again. By trying to write about a text, readers realize that there are some parts in the texts they don't really understand. That is, writing helps readers notice that they don't really understand the texts they have just read, and encourages them to go back and reexamine the texts enough to respond to them. Zamel (1992) aptly describes how writing can reinforce and improve reading in this way:

> Writing is a way to resee texts and so lets us grapple with uncertainties, reflect on the complexities, deal with the puzzlements, and offer approximative readings. By providing us a means for working out a reading, writing allows insights that may have been inaccessible or inchoate at the time that the text was read. (p.472)

2. General implications of the practical linkages: Integrating writing and reading in teaching

As stated above, writing and reading have a complementary, bi-directional, mutually reinforcing relationship at a very practical level. It is necessary for ESL/EFL teachers to recognize this relationship, to exploit it in their teaching, and even to teach it explicitly to the students. The key here is to exploit it *intentionally*. Teachers should incorporate reading into writing and writing into reading intentionally so that students can understand that writing and reading indeed reinforce each other.

Dubin and Olshtain (1980) propose the idea of writing/reading integration by stating that "it is accepted that in spoken communication, there is a significant relationship between producing speech and understanding speech. Why not adopt a similar approach in written communication?"(p.354). Reid (1993) also points out the effectiveness of writing/reading integration. She states that "having students write about reading and read about writing should lead to more effective written communication"(p.66). When we write, we think about the readers. When we read, we think about the writers. It may be better to say that

we cannot write without thinking about the readers and we cannot read without thinking about the writers. Therefore, teaching writing and reading together is more effective and efficient than teaching them separately.

Reid (1993) makes an interesting statement about the practical connection of writing and reading and its implication for teaching.

> All student writers read: they read about writing, they read the writing of others, and most important, they read and re-read their own writing as they write. And readers, particularly good readers, often write: they outline, they summarize, they respond to, and they synthesize their reading. Reading has always been a part of the ESL writing classroom. (p.64)

This statement reveals and suggests that teachers can easily integrate writing and reading more fully, for integration of writing and reading occurs to some extent quite unconsciously in the classroom. In other words, the integration of writing and reading is very normal and natural in ESL/EFL classroom.

However, precisely because it is very natural, neither teachers nor students may be fully conscious of that relationship. If the teachers want the writing and the reading classrooms to be more effective and efficient, they must be fully cognizant themselves of that relationship, and moreover, exploit it and teach it to the students explicitly. As Eisterhold (1990) states emphatically, "the relationship between reading and writing should be exploited" and teachers "need to be explicit in their teaching of that relation" (p.100). What is important is to keep the practical, mutually reinforcing, relationship of writing and reading in mind and exploit it *intentionally*.

The first teaching implication is that teachers should incorporate reading into the teaching of writing. One way is to have students read relevant texts before writing. This is a very orthodox way of incorporating reading into writing. In this case, reading functions as the information source which can be used in writing. Another approach is to have students read other students' writings in the course of writing, which seems to be more effective than the first one. This is similar to "peer-reading" which is often conducted in today's ESL classrooms. Reid (1993) explains why this technique is effective.

> The social communities of peer groups provide student writers with a real audience, and because student writers are often alienated from their audience and find it difficult to remember what the readers need to know, working in a small group of peers allows writers to explore the effectiveness of their ideas. They discover what they know and don't know, and what their readers understand and don't understand. (p.156)

The effectiveness of peer-reading is that writers can assess their own writings through peers' comments. Of course this is very helpful to the students and encourages them to revise their writings.

However, what we are more interested in here is that simply reading other students' writings in a peer-reading activity can itself give students new information for their own writing. It is not just comments made by peers but also the reading of a peers' writing that is important. Reading their peers' writing gives the students various pieces of information which did not come to mind when they themselves wrote initially. This will surely encourage them to revise their own initial writing. The reading itself tends to reinforce and improve their own writing. Therefore, in setting up peer-reading activities, it is very important for teachers to have each students read as many writings as possible. This exposure will make students realize that reading during writing is useful and that there is certainly a complementary relationship between writing and reading.

Conversely, of course, writing reinforces reading. The implication for teaching is that teachers should incorporate writing into the teaching of reading. One of the easiest ways, of course, is to have the students do writing activities after reading texts, and teachers indeed have long used writing for activities *after* reading.

However, Zamel (1992) advocates writing *during* reading as well. She states that writing "after the text has been read, analyzed, worked through", used alone, does not exploit the true complementary relationship of writing and reading. She continues, explaining that "these writing activities keep hidden from developing readers/writers the fact that one can find one's reactions and responses to texts by reflecting on them through writing" (p.469). She argues that writing should be "used as a means for understanding the text" *during* the reading process. (p.468). By trying to write reactions and responses to texts early on, students can discover that they do not understand the texts fully, and are encouraged to go back to the texts and read them again. What is important is that, after writing a partial reaction to a text, students need to go back to the text, read it again, and deepen their understanding. Therefore, writing should be done before the reading process is finished, namely, *during* the process of reading.

Zamel (1992) also points out a third way that writing can be used to reinforce reading---i.e. writing *before* reading. She states that "writing about and considering issues, themes, or concepts before reading about them prepares students to view texts with 'a writer's eye', to appreciate author's perspectives and decisions, to read, in other words, like a writer" (p.479). Writing before reading seems a very good way to have students understand the relationship between readers and writers. Therefore, besides writing *after* reading, writing *during* reading and writing *before* reading are both good ways to integrate writing with the teaching of reading. Writing can thus reinforce reading.

Thus, the two implications for teaching arising from the practical parallels between writing and reading are that reading should be integrated in the teaching of writing and that writing should be integrated in the teaching of reading. Each can reinforce the other.

Ⅲ. Suggestions for Japanese high school teachers of English

In the Japanese high schools, writing class and reading class are two separate courses, taught by different teachers. Therefore, in this chapter, I will introduce how to integrate reading into the writing class, so as to improve writing; then I will introduce how to integrate writing into the reading class, so as to improve reading.

A. Practical suggestions for the writing teacher: teaching writing as an active constructive recursive process, closely linked to reading

As established in the previous chapter, writing is an active constructive recursive process. Writers actively construct meaning through interaction between their own texts and their background knowledge, or "schemata". However, we Japanese high school teachers of English generally have treated writing as being basically the translation of Japanese into English. "Students have no opportunity to freely write what they want because not only the topic but also the content is already presented in Japanese to the students. All they have to do is to translate the given Japanese into English" (Shirai, 1995, p.3). As a result, we have laid more emphasis on accuracy, primarily grammatical accuracy, than on either fluency or content. This is not writing in a true sense. We need to change the notion of writing drastically. We teachers need to recognize ourselves what writers really do when they write. Then, through our teaching, we need to help the students see that writing is a process of discovering and formulating and reformulating ideas through writing itself, that is, that writing is a process of constructing meaning actively and recursively. Moreover, we need to help students realize that reading makes writing easier, ---i.e. that reading reinforces writing, for example, by giving them new information or ideas for their writing.

How can we accomplish these goals? There are three main ways that we Japanese writing teachers can improve our teaching. (1) First, we need to encourage the students to draw on their background knowledge, to activate their "schemata" before writing during the class. (2) Second, we should give the students a chance to *expand* their schemata probably at several points throughout the composing process and in various ways, most notably by integrating reading of writing into the writing process. (3) Finally, we should give the students a chance to go back to their writings again and again so that they can realize that their writing may change as their schemata expand. Through these activities, students can see that their writing becomes more and more developed, that is, writing is a recursive process.

In the following section, I will present these principles in the form of "Practical Suggestions", and will include several "Teaching Samples" of exercises and activities,

showing how each can be utilized in Japanese high school English writing classes. The topic for writing on which the teaching samples are based is the "Japanese bath".

Practical Suggestion 1: Include Pre-writing Work

Pre-writing is very important for encouraging students to draw on their background knowledge, to "activate their schemata". Various "pre-writing activities" for this purpose will make their writing much easier, because "the period before the actual writing begins, that is, how writers get and form ideas before putting pen to paper" (Zamel, 1982, p.199) is the hardest part in writing. The teachers should give the students plenty of time and provide them with activities to explore their thoughts to discover what they want to say.

Teaching Sample 1: Pre-writing Activities

① The teacher (T) says and writes on the board the writing topic, the purpose of writing and the audience.

Topic: A Japanese bath

Purpose: To tell the ALT something about a Japanese bath

Audience: the ALT, who is from the United States

ALT: Assistant Language Teacher. Here, the ALT is a native speaker of English who is hired as an assistant teacher of English as part of the JET Program (the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program)

② T divides the class into eight groups of five.

③ T tells the students (Ss) to do brainstorming in each group.

④ T tells one group to write what they thought about on the blackboard.

⑤ T allows any other group to come up to the blackboard to add other information.

⑥ Ss will see all of what was written on the board.

Through such pre-writing activities, students can activate their existent background knowledge, and at the same time they can get ideas which they have not thought of by themselves. This pre-writing activity helps the students realize that activation of background knowledge makes their writing easier, that is, that it is a very effective strategy when they write.

Practical Suggestion 2: Use reading activities to reinforce the writing process (i.e. to "expand schemata")

A second technique that the Japanese writing teacher needs to use at various points in the writing process is to encourage the students to *expand* their background knowledge. If students can see that there are a great number of ideas about a given topic, and that there are a

great many ways to present ideas, ---i.e. if they add some new information to their own "schemata", their own writing will improve. How can we teachers accomplish this? There are at least two very practical ways that a teacher can help students to expand their schemata. Both use reading to reinforce writing. One technique is to have the students read a text on the writing topic. Another is to give them a chance to read the writing of other students. These are discussed and illustrated below.

Reading a Related Text

If teachers have the students read a text on the writing topic after they finish writing their first drafts, they will get new knowledge or ideas and approach the topic from different points of view. By having them read a related text, we can get students to sense that (1) writing changes as their background knowledge expands, in other words, writing is a recursive process, and that (2) reading reinforces writing.

Teaching Sample 2: Reading a Related Text

① Before T gives Ss a related text, T informs them of the title of the text, "Japanese and American baths".
② T has Ss brainstorm and has several students give facts and description about "Japanese baths" and, especially, "American baths". T writes their ideas down on the board.
③ T gives each of the students the handout with a related text, Reading 1 "Japanese and American baths".(Appendix 1).
④ After individual silent reading, T divides the class into eight groups of five and has each group discuss the text. The discussion questions are as follows.
- Have you ever taken an American bath? Where?
- How did you feel about the American bath?
- Which bath do you like better? Why?
- Discuss the differences between Japanese baths and American baths.

Prior to this reading, at the beginning of the sample lesson, students had been given the purpose of this writing. It was "to tell the ALT something about a Japanese bath". In the stage of pre-writing, they had brainstormed about a Japanese bath. Therefore, students had already activated their background knowledge about a Japanese bath, and their first drafts were based on that background knowledge. However, at this point, upon reading this new text, students may find a new point of view. For example, they may decide that it may be better to write by comparing or contrasting a Japanese bath with an American bath than to write about only a Japanese bath, because the ALT is from the United States. Thus, reading

a related text expands the students' background knowledge and can develop their writing.

After reading and discussing the related text, students can go back to their pieces of writing again, and revise them from a new point of view to produce second drafts. Integrating reading with writing in this way seems to be very effective.

Exchanging Writing with Each Other: Peer-reading with feedback

A second teaching technique that can expand each student's "schemata" is to have them read another student's paper. Peer-reading is quite usual in the writing classroom which treats writing as a process, offering several advantages. One is that students have a chance to see if their writing is understandable to other students. That is, this activity encourages the students to write their own writing from a reader's point of view. Through this activity, students will realize that writing has a close relationship to reading. In addition, peer-reading helps the students expand their own schemata because they have to read what other students have written and to make and get comments about their own and their classmates' pieces of writing. Through this activity, students may get some other new ideas or points of view which they haven't thought of so far. Thus, this technique is very helpful to the students, and encourages them to go back to their writing once again and develop it.

Teaching Sample 3: Peer-reading and Feedback

① T divides the class into eight groups of five and tells each group to exchange their second drafts with each other.
② T tells each student to read all the drafts of other students in the group.
③ T tells Ss to give comments to each student of the group. In this stage, T can give them worksheet to write some comments on. The sheet may include like the following:

- What information did the writer want to give the ALT?
- Does the writer need to write more information? If so, what?
- What did you like about this writing?
- Are all the sentences clear? Find two or three very clear sentences.

Practical Suggestion 3: Include opportunities for revising as part of the process

The third technique that the Japanese writing teacher needs to use at various points during the writing process is to have the students revise their writing. Revision can occur at two or three points in the writing process. Students can revise their writing after reading a related text, Reading 1, as mentioned above. Revision can also come after getting comments and some more new knowledge from peer-reading. In both cases, the students gains new information and can go back to their pieces of writing again and revise them. Revising should be done at least two times because the purpose of revising is to have students realize that writing is a process of *recursive* construction of meaning.

If teachers can incorporate these three "Practical Suggestions" into the process of writing or composing, students will come to sense that writing is an active recursive construction of meaning that occurs through the interaction of their own texts and their background knowledge and will also sense that reading reinforces writing.

B. Practical suggestions for the reading teacher: teaching reading as an active constructive recursive process, closely linked to writing

Reading is also an active constructive recursive process. Readers actively construct meaning through an interaction between the text and the reader's background knowledge, or "schemata". However, in general, Japanese high school teachers of English regard reading as a passive linear process in which readers decode a text and extract the author's meaning by using their knowledge mainly about English grammar and vocabulary. As a result, we Japanese English teachers have put the emphasis on grammar and vocabulary as a tool for "decoding" and have not realized how important the reader's own contribution of meaning is in a broader sense. Therefore, we need to shift our focus more toward exploiting and developing the students' "schemata" as a means of enabling them to construct meaning when they read. That is, readers construct meaning (i.e. "understand" a text) by incorporating new information appearing in texts into their own framework made of their schemata; we as teachers need to work to facilitate that process.

To accomplish this overall goal or change in focus, there are four specific principles that we Japanese reading teachers need to try to incorporate in our teaching. (1) First, we should give the students an opportunity to activate existent schemata before reading during the class. This will make their reading easier. (2) Second, we should give the students a chance to exploit and expand their schemata at various stages, most importantly by exploiting the link between writing and reading so that they sense that reading is an active and recursive process. If we integrate writing into reading by having the students *write* their responses to the text, it will help them to discover some parts they really don't understand, and encourage

them to go back to reading, and deepen or revise their understanding of the text. In addition, if we have the students read other students' text interpretations or responses to a text, they will realize that there are various interpretations of a text, and they can expand their own schemata, and also will want to go back to reading again. (3) Third, we should give the students a chance to go back to a text again so that they can realize that their interpretations of a text may change as their schemata develop and change, and that reading is a recursive process. (4) Finally, we should give students the chance to read a related text. Used as a post-reading activity, reading a similar text can give them a chance to use the knowledge they have acquired through a series of reading activities. They can retain their knowledge by using it. In this stage, students can feel that reading has become easier, or at least that their schemata have expanded.

In the following section, I will present these four principles as "Practical Suggestions", including several "Teaching Samples" of activities showing how each can be realized in Japanese high school English reading classes. The reading text which is used here is "Reading 2: Louis Armstrong's Life" in Appendix 2 and a related text is "Reading 3: Louis Armstrong As a Child in the Waifs' Home" in Appendix 3.

Practical Suggestion 1: Include Pre-reading Work

We can think of at least two ways to include pre-reading in our reading classes. One includes a variety of what are usually called "pre-reading activities", such as webbing, mapping, and brainstorming. The other is "writing before reading".

Pre-reading Activities

Utilizing pre-reading activities is very important because doing so can activate the students' schemata, so that they can interpret the text more readily. Carrell and Eisterhold (1983) state that "providing background information and previewing content for the reader seem to be the most obvious strategies for the language teacher" (p.567). Japanese high school teachers of English generally have not fully understood the value of pre-reading activities for fostering reading comprehension. What is important here is that the teachers should have the students relate the topic or content of the text they are about to read to their own experiences or lives, to what they already know. This is not only because "readers tend to be interested in reading texts that are relevant to their own experiences" (ibid.), but more importantly because to give a meaning to a text a student needs to relate it to what he/she already knows. A pre-reading activity for the text "Reading 2: Louis Armstrong's Life", contained in Appendix 2, is given below.

Teaching Sample 4: Pre-reading Activity

① T has Ss listen to *Hello Dolly* (Louis Armstrong's song) without letting them know whose song it is.

② T asks Ss the following questions.

- Have you ever listened to this song?
- Do you know who sang this song?

--- T tells Ss that this song was sung by Louis Armstrong.

- Do you like this song?
- Do you know what kind of music it is?

③ After getting the answer "jazz", T has Ss say something about jazz and elicits a web from them, writing it on the board. If Ss can't say many things, T encourages them by asking the following questions.

- What countries do you think of ?
- What cities do you think of ?
- What instruments do you think of?
- Do you know the names of jazz musicians?

④ If there are some students who know jazz, T lets him/her say what he/she knows about jazz.

Writing before Reading

The purpose of writing before reading is to have the students understand the relationship between readers and writers by having students prepare to "view texts with 'a writer's eye'" (Zamel, 1992, p.479). The sample reading material is a kind of biography of Louis Armstrong, so one way to "write before reading" would be to have the students write their own autobiography. Through this activity, the teachers can give the students a chance to think about how a biographical text is organized, what kinds of events are included, etc.

Teaching Sample 5: Writing-before-reading Activity

① T tells Ss that Ss are going to write their autobiography before reading the text.

② Before having Ss write their autobiography, T advises Ss to think about the following things.

- What kind of text organization is appropriate for (auto)biography?
  a. order of importance
  b. order of familiarity
  c. chronological order

- Which period do you want to write about most?
  a. before kindergarten
  b. in kindergarten
  c. in elementary school
  d. in junior high school
  e. in high school

③ T gives Ss 30～40minutes and has Ss write their own autobiography.

Such student generated texts can be used to introduce the reading text by linking the known with the new. Teaching Sample 6 illustrates one possibility:

Teaching Sample 6: Skimming to Compare

① T gives Ss questions for skimming the text on "Louis Armstrong's Life".
- How is this text organized?
  a. order of importance
  b. order of familiarity
  c. chronological order
- This text is divided into four parts. Give an appropriate title to each part from the following choices.
  a. Developing Skills
  b. Overcoming Obstacles
  c. Growing Up
  d. Becoming Extremely Successful

② T has Ss check their answers with their partner.

③ T has Ss compare this text with their own autobiography. Points are:
- Is the organization of both texts the same?
- Why do you think Reading 1 deals with "Growing Up", "Developing Skills", "Overcoming Obstacles", and "Becoming Extremely Successful?
- What period did you write about in your autobiography? Why?

④ T has them check their answers with their partner, and after that, has several students answer them aloud.

Practical Suggestion 2: Use Writing activities to Reinforce the Reading Process by "expanding schemata"

After the activities stated above, students begin to do the thorough reading of the text. In this stage, it is very important for the students to understand the details of the text. One way to accomplish this is to integrate writing into reading. Doing so can expand the writer's background knowledge so that reading will become easier. There are two very effective techniques for using writing activities to reinforce the reading process in this sense.

Writing during Reading

One technique is to have students *write* their impressions of the text. This sort of activity will help them find the parts they don't really understand, encourage them to go back to the text, and deepen their understanding of it. Students will realize that writing reinforces reading and that text interpretation can be revised.

Teaching Sample 7: Writing during Reading

T gives Ss 15～20 minutes and has them write about the following topic.
"What was the most impressive part of this text? Why?"

Exchanging Writings with Each Other

A second technique is to have the students exchange their *writings* about the text with each other. Here, too, we should notice that writing plays an important role in this reading lesson. The purpose of this stage is to give students a chance to read as many writings as possible and see as many responses to the text as possible. Students will understand that texts are open to interpretation, and also that reading what other students have written gives them some new knowledge and expands their schemata.

In the present situation in Japan, the regular English class in high schools is made up of about 40 students, so the teacher can divide the class into eight groups of five and give them a chance to read the writings of at least four other students.

Teaching Sample 8: Exchanging Writings with Each Other

① T tells Ss to make eight groups of five.
② T tells them to exchange their writings with each other in the group and read them.
③ After finishing reading, Ss will write short comments about each writing.

Practical Suggestion 3: Include Going Back to Texts

The teacher should have the students go back into the text a second time. Following this principle will help the students see that they can interpret the text differently, more fully, if they look at it more than once, particularly if they have expanded their own background knowledge in between.

As an example of such an exercise, teachers can have students answer the same comprehension check questions in two rounds, once *before* having them go back to the text, and again *after* having them go back to the text a second time. When the students answer the comprehension check questions the first time, teachers will simply collect the papers and put them aside without going over the answers. Later, after the students have gone back to the text a second time and have answered the same questions again, teachers can have the students check their answers. Students will realize how their comprehension has developed by comparing the score they get before going back to the text with the score they get after going back to it.

Teaching Sample 9: Going Back to Texts

① T tells Ss to go back to reading the text again, and then answer the comprehension check questions that they tried to answer before. Some sample questions are given below:

- Type 1 (True or False Questions)

  Paragraph 1: ___ When Louis was a little child, he was very poor.
  Paragraph 2: ___ The place where Louis lived was full of music.
  Paragraph 3: ___ Louis wanted to play music, but couldn't play music because he was arrested.

- Type 2 (Multiple Choices)

  1. Where was Louis born and brought up?
     a. Africa b. Chicago c. New Orleans
  2. Where did Louis learn to read music and play the cornet?
     a. at home b. in music school c. in reform school
  3. After Louis left reform school, who taught him music?
     a. his manager b. Joe Oliver c. Joe Glaser

② Ss check the answers with the student sitting next to them.

③ T has several students answer the questions aloud, and makes sure of the correct answers.

Practical Suggestion 4: Include the Reading of Related Texts at the End

A fourth suggestion for teaching reading as active and recursive is for the teacher to include the reading of a text on a related topic as a wrap-up activity. This activity will allow the students to apply their expanded knowledge or new "schemata" to another text. The technique can be effective in that students can usually feel an improvement in their reading because the subject matter is now familiar. If the level of the related text is about as the same as the main text, they will feel that reading the related text is easier than reading the main text was. This principle will help them develop positive attitudes toward reading.

Teaching Sample 10: Reading Related Texts

① T gives Ss a handout with the related text, "Reading 3: Louis Armstrong As a Child in the Waifs' Home"(Appendix 3).

② T tells them to read the text and answer the questions on the sheet.

③ T has several students answer the questions aloud and make sure of the correct answers.

If teachers can incorporate these four "Practical Suggestions" in their teaching of reading, students will sense that reading is an active recursive construction of meaning occurring through interaction of texts and their background knowledge and will also see that writing reinforces reading.

Conclusion

Two striking parallels exist between the writing and the reading processes. First, writing and reading are similar cognitively in that both can be considered processes of active recursive construction of meaning through interaction between the text and the writer's/reader's background knowledge. Second, writing and reading have a close practical relationship in that each provides information sources to the other and each tends to reinforce and improve the other.

The general implications for teaching writing and reading are profound. If teachers can take advantage of these parallels, the teaching of writing and the teaching of reading will certainly become more effective and efficient. Teachers of writing and of reading can exploit the first parallel by demonstrating that writing and reading entail almost the same processes. Teachers of writing and of reading can exploit the second parallel by incorporating reading in the teaching of writing and writing in the teaching of reading intentionally so that students can understand that writing and reading indeed reinforce each other.

What can all this mean more specifically for the Japanese high school teacher of English? The two parallels and their general implications for teaching writing and reading *can* be exploited in the Japanese situation of a separate writing and a separate reading class. To date, of course, in Japanese high schools, teaching English has been greatly influenced by university entrance examinations. In both English writing and reading classes, translation is still emphasized and the teachers tend to focus on grammatical accuracy. However, more teachers have begun to change the way of teaching English partly because of the policy of the Ministry of Education, and partly because of the need for real communicative competence in English created by internationalization. At this juncture, practical suggestions and alternative teaching approaches can be very useful for Japanese teachers who would like to change their way of teaching English. The last section of this paper provided two such sets of practical suggestions with actual teaching samples, one set for the writing teacher and one set for the reading teacher in Japan. The suggestions exploit the parallels between writing and reading, even though the two courses remain separate. In essence, for teaching either writing or reading, incorporating the one in teaching the other is more effective and efficient than trying to isolate and separate them. That is, the integration of reading in the teaching of writing, and of writing in the teaching of reading, will certainly help students improve their proficiencies.

Appendix 1

Reading 1: Japanese and American Baths

When people ask me what I miss most about my country, I first think about my family and the wonderful meals my mother used to cook for me. Then, I think about my bathtub. I know that may seem strange to someone who has never had a Japanese bath, but when I get homesick and stressed out from living in this new country and culture, I think about my bath.

Japanese and Americans use their bathtubs for different purposes, and as a result, their bathrooms are quite different. The American bathtub is used primarily to get one's body clean. Japanese people, on the other hand, like to use their bathtubs as a place for relaxation. A warm bath at the end of the day helps them to unwind and get rid of stress. When I take a bath, it usually lasts one hour or more, and I use that time to think.

Because of the different purposes of American and Japanese bathtubs, they are quite different physically. American bathtubs are long and shallow. They are made out of porcelain or fiberglass, and they come in many colors, but they are usually white. American baths are most often in the same room as the toilet, and there is usually a shower above the bathtub. A shower curtain pulls across the front of the tub so that water won't get on the floor while someone is showering. Japanese bathtubs are very deep and can be made from many different types of materials. Some are made from porcelain or fiberglass, just like American tubs. However, others are made from tile and wood. Unlike Americans, we wash ourselves off before we enter the bathtub. We stand outside of the tub when we do this and let the water we pour over ourselves run down a drain in the floor. A toilet would get wet if it were in the same room as the tub, so our toilets are always in a separate room. Further, because we don't have to worry about getting the floor wet, there is no shower curtain around the tub.

Sometimes Americans do like to use their tub to relax. It seems like they do this when they have extra time or have had a really bad day. When Americans take a bath they like to add lots of special soap, which often smells good and makes a lot of bubbles. Unlike Americans, most Japanese use their bathtubs to relax every night. However, Japanese never add bubbles to their baths. Rather, they sometimes add special powders, which have minerals in them that are good for the skin and make the bath seem like a natural hot spring.

Finally, when Americans take baths, they use a tub of clean water for every person. Maybe they do this because their bathtubs don't use a lot of water and to fill a tub is not too expensive. In contrast, filling a Japanese bath is very expensive. As a result, everyone in the family uses the same water.

Japanese and American baths are very different in the way they look and the ways they are used. Although both kinds of tubs serve their purpose, for me, it is difficult to really relax in an American bathtub. So when I think of the things that I really miss from home, I think about my Japanese bath.

By Masae (a student from Japan)

(*READ to WRITE* published by McGraw-Hill, 1997, p.p. 183-184)

Appendix 2

Reading 2: Louis Armstrong's Life

Part 1

¶1 Louis's parents were separated, and his mother was always short of cash. Louis sold papers and ran errands to help make ends meet. Every dime he could earn was a big help. When he was only nine years old, he sold buckets of coal from door-to-door. Louis first performed in public when he was about ten. He and his friends sang in the streets of New Orleans, Louisiana, earning a few cents to take home to their families.

¶2 Louis and his mother lived in Storyville, a tough district of New Orleans. It was an exciting place for a boy. Music from the dance halls and clubs spilled out onto the sidewalks. Often ragtime bands marched through the streets, playing their honky-tonk music. Louis and his friends would tag along behind the musicians. "I was brought up around music," he once said.

¶3 Although Louis loved music, he had no chance to play it. His mother could not afford music lessons. He might never have become a famous jazz trumpet player if he had not become too excited one night when he was about twelve. During a New Year's Eve celebration, he fired a pistol into the air---and was arrested. "I was just a kid," he later recalled. "Oh, but I cried." This proved to be the turning point of his life. He was sent to a reform school, and there he learned to read music and play the cornet, an instrument similar to a trumpet.

Part 2

¶4 Louis was thirteen when he left reform school. Taking odd jobs, he earned enough money to continue music lessons and buy a second-hand cornet. In the evenings, he went to local clubs to hear musicians. He was so eager to learn that the famous bandleader Joe "King" Oliver agreed to teach him. Soon Louis was playing so well that he was often asked to fill in with local bands.

¶5 For the next few years, Louis played with jazz bands on the Mississippi river boats and around New Orleans. Then he was asked by King Oliver to join his new Creole Jazz Band in Chicago. Louis made his first recording in 1923 with Oliver. His playing was attracting a lot of attention and so was his deep, gravely singing voice.

¶6 In the mid-1920s, Louis switched from the cornet to the trumpet. Soon he was performing with number of different bands. His trumpet playing was joyful, and he experimented as he played. He did not stick only to the Dixieland style but also played freely, setting jazz on a new path.

¶7 Louis was the first to record scat, a new type of singing that uses syllables instead of words. This happened during a recording session when he dropped his sheet music and could not remember the words. It sounded so good that other jazz singers copied the style. During this period, he teamed up with other musicians to make the "Hot Five" and "Hot Seven" recordings. These records greatly influenced the development of jazz. By 1925, Louis had formed his own band.

Part 3

¶8 Although Louis's life was generally successful to this point, he went through some very hard times. For example, while he was still working with local New Orleans bands, Louis wrote a song, "I Wish I Could Shimmy Like My Sister Kate." A company published it but never paid him nor gave him credit as the composer.

¶9 Louis had an especially tough time in the 1930s. His manager was incompetent. Not only did he get Louis into debt, but also he arranged so many concerts that Louis had problems with his lip. It split open when he played.

¶10 Eventually, Louis fired his manager and hired Joe Glaser. Joe helped Louis get out of debt. He convinced Louis to play popular music to attract a wider audience. Many of Louis's fans criticized him for this and turned to other jazz musicians. But by the late 1940s, Louis concentrated on jazz again.

Part 4

¶11 His fame spread, and soon he became the leading jazz musician of the day. He was offered parts on Broadway shows and movies. By the 1950s, Louis was famous throughout the world. He visited Africa in 1956, and during the 1960s, he toured in countries as far away as Australia, Iceland, Japan, and Czechoslovakia. Everywhere he went he was greeted by adoring fans.

¶12 In 1964, he had his all-time greatest hit, "Hello Dolly," which replaced a Beatles album on the top of the record charts. During his career he made almost two thousand recordings, including "Mack the Knife," "Blueberry Hill," and "What a Wonderful World."

¶13 During the last twenty years of his life, Louis was considered one of the greatest jazz singers in the world and by far the greatest trumpet player. He had long been known as Satchmo, which is a shortened version of satchel-mouth. He was given this nickname because of his large mouth---it seemed as big as a traveling bag, or satchel. Now he was hailed as Satchmo the Great. He traveled all over the world and became an "ambassador" of jazz. He continued to perform and make recordings almost to the end of his life.

¶14 In March, 1971, Louis had a heart attack and was put in the hospital to recover. On July 5 of that year, he felt well enough to set up a rehearsal with his band. The next day, Louis died at home in his sleep.

(Adapted from *GREAT AFRICAN AMERICANS IN JAZZ* written by Carlotta Hacker, Crabtree Publishing Company, 1997)

Appendix 3

The following passage is also about a part of the life of Louis Armstrong. Compare it with Reading 1 and answer the questions below.

Reading 3: Louis Armstrong As a Child in the Waifs' Home

Louis Armstrong felt very lonely at the Waifs' Home. However, one day, the principal of the Waifs' Home, Captain Jones, spoke to him. Captain Jones encouraged him to learn to play the bugle. The following passage begins with the conversation between Captain Jones and Louis. Captain Jones starts talking about how he learned to play the bugle when he was a young soldier in France.

Captain Jones said, "While I was there, I was a bugler in the army. I played a bugle to tell the men when to get up in the morning and when to go to bed at night."

"Golly!" exclaimed Louis. "You must have felt important blowing that bugle."

"I guess I did, but I also learned much about music," continued Captain Jones. "After I returned home, I drilled a group of men in a drum and bugle corps. Some of these men started to call me Captain, and the name has stuck with me ever since."

Suddenly Captain Jones had an idea. He turned to Louis and asked, "How would you like to learn to play a bugle and become our bugler here at the Waifs' Home?"

"Oh, thank you, but do you think I can learn to play a bugle?" said Louis haltingly.

"Why, of course you can," replied Captain Jones. "Meet me here again after dinner."

Just then the dinner bell rang, and Louis rushed for the dining hall. "Gee, Captain Jones, you're great," he called back. "I'm as hungry as a bear."

Louis eagerly took his place at a table. Then right after grace was said, he tore into his plate of food. Captain Jones watched from a distance, now sure Louis' loneliness was over. Mrs. Jones watched, too, as she looked over and gave Louis a motherly smile.

After dinner Captain Jones came with a bugle. Louis started to practice at once, and later he became bugler at the Waifs' Home. He blew the bugle to let the boys know when to get up in the morning and when to go to bed at night. He felt very important with this assignment.

After this, Louis began to enjoy living at the home. He still was eager to see his mother and sister, and they were allowed to come to see him regularly. From then on he was completely happy there. He felt that the Waifs' Home was a second home and that Mrs. Jones was a second mother.

(Adapted from *Louis Armstrong---Young Music Maker* by Dharathula H. Millender, Aladdin Paperbacks)

1. Which paragraph in Reading 2 briefly mentions the events in Reading 3?
2. What was the Waifs' Home called in Reading 2?

Bibliography

Barnett, M. (1989). More than meets the eye: Foreign language reading theory and practice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Carrell, P. L., and Eisterhold, J. C. (1983) Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy, TESOL Quarterly, 17(4), 553-573.

Cobine, G. R. (1995). Writing as a response to reading. ERIC Digest.

Crandall, J. J. (1995). The why, what and how of ESL reading instruction: Some guidelines for writers of ESL reading textbooks. In P. Byrd (Ed.), Material writers guide (pp.79-94). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Dubin F., & Olshtain, E. (1980). The interface of writing and reading. TESOL Quarterly, 14(3), 353-363.

Eisterhold, J. C. (1990). Reading-writing connections: Toward a description for second language learners. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom. (pp. 88-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W. (1991). Current development in second language reading research, TESOL Quarterly, 25(3), 375-406.

Ishihara, S. (1996). Teaching communicative writing: Suggestions for high school English teachers in Japan. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 397 633)

Johnson, P. (1986). Acquisition of schema for comprehension and communication: A study of the reading-writing relationship in ESL. RELC Journal, 17(1), 1-13.

Johnson, P. (1991). The reading/writing relationship: A pedagogical study. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 341 258)

Law, G. (1995). Ideologies of English language education in Japan. JALT Journal, 17(2), 213-224.

Melvin, B. S., & Stout, D. F. (1987). Motivating language learners through authentic materials. In W. M. Rivers (Ed.), Interactive language teaching (pp. 44-56). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Papalia, A. (1987). Interaction of reader and text. In W. M. Rivers (Ed.), Interactive language teaching (pp. 70-82). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rabideau, D. (1993). Integrating reading and writing into adult ESL instruction. ERIC Digest.

Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. TESOL Quarterly, 25(3), 407-430.

Reid, J. M. (1993). Teaching ESL writing. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Shanahan, T. (1984). Nature of the reading-writing relation: An exploratory multivariate analysis. Journal of educational psychology, 76(3), 466-477.

Shanahan, T., & Lomax, R. G. (1986). An analysis and comparison of theoretical models of the reading-writing relationship. Journal of educational psychology, 78(2), 116-123.

Shih, M. (1992). Beyond comprehension exercises in the ESL academic reading class. TESOL Quarterly, 26(2), 289-318.

Shirai, H. (1995). Freewriting: An interhemispheric approach to language communication. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 381 008)

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning, TESOL Quarterly, 16(2), 195-209.

Zamel, V. (1992). Writing one's way into reading. TESOL Quarterly, 26(3), 463-485.